

13th March 1928]

Inspection work done by the Labour Commissioner during his tour.

1725 Q.—Swami A. S. SAHAJANANDAM: Will the hon the Home Member be pleased to state whether the Labour Commissioner examines the records of District Labour offices in the mufassal, and whether during his tour he personally inspects the places where measures for the amelioration of the depressed classes are reported to have been taken up by his subordinate officers?

A.—The Government have no reason to believe that the Commissioner fails to make such inspections as he thinks necessary.

Labour

Qualifications for occupying the post of the Labour Commissioner.

1726 Q.—Swami A. S. SAHAJANANDAM: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state whether district experience is one of the essential qualifications required for the Labour Commissioner?

A.—No special qualifications have been prescribed.

III

COMMUNICATIONS TO THE COUNCIL.

The Secretary laid on the table copies of:

(i) G.O. No. 109, Development, dated 20th January 1928, passing orders on the audit report of the Russellkonda Saw Mill for 1926-27.

(ii) G.O. No. 322 W., dated 2nd February 1928, passing orders on the accounts of Willingdon House, Ootacamund, for 1926 and 1927.

[*Note.*—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

IV

ACT ASSENTED TO BY HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I have to announce that the Tuticorin Port Trust (Amendment) Act, 1927, received the assent of His Excellency the Governor-General on 27th January 1928."

V

STATEMENTS OF THE EX-MINISTERS ON THEIR RESIGNATION.

* Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"Mr. President, let me thank you, Sir, for your kindness in giving me permission to make a statement before this House explaining the reasons that led to my resignation of the office of the Minister for Public Health and Excise. In making this statement, Sir, I shall try as far as I can, to avoid personalities. But I think, Sir, it will be recognized that it will be impossible for me altogether to desist from making some personal references. Among the causes that led to my

[Mr. R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar] [13th March 1928]

resignation there are those which I might describe as proximate and others which I may describe as immediate. Among the proximate causes that ultimately led to my resignation I may mention the fact that owing to various causes there was a good deal of unpleasantness amongst us Ministers. (Hear, hear.)

11-15 a.m. "I shall be treading on delicate ground by venturing into details and I do not want that all our dirty linen should be washed before the public. But among the many reasons which had led to this disunion in the Ministry I would give the first place to the fact that although there was an attempt in this province to establish the convention of joint responsibility, we among ourselves were never united on that point. Joint responsibility meant joint consultation, and it is a matter of common knowledge that in many cases action was taken on important matters without anything approaching joint consultation. It is unreasonable to expect any one of the Ministers to take the responsibility for the actions of his colleagues in which there was no joint consultation. Joint responsibility, Sir, means joint consultation. In this Province, the late Governor Lord Willingdon tried to start the convention of joint responsibility. The House is aware that nowhere in the Government of India Act or in the present constitution is there any reference made to the Chief Minister. In other Presidencies, there is no Chief Minister at all. In this province, when the convention of having a Chief Minister was started, the implications of joint responsibility followed and joint responsibility should have been preceded by joint consultation. On account of the failure of joint consultation, we have had often a good deal of trouble and unpleasantness among us Ministers; and when later our personal conversations failed on the subject, I raised the question officially and even then I failed and my Colleague hon. Dr. Subbarayan resisted and resented my raising the question at all. (Cries of 'hear, hear' and 'the cat is out of the bag.') It is no surprise therefore that in our counsels we were never united, and all attempts to secure joint responsibility have failed so far.

"Coming next to the question of the Simon Commission, one of the causes that led to the trouble was the premature statement on the subject issued to the press by Dr. Subbarayan. As soon as the personnel of the Commission was announced, we decided that we should call a meeting of our party. A party meeting was fixed; but in the meantime, Dr. Subbarayan, for reasons of his own, issued a statement which showed to his Colleagues that he repudiated the necessity for joint consultation and consultation of the party. In spite of our endeavours the statement was issued, and we had the unpleasantness of differing on this question.

"Then, Sir, as the joint Ministry was supposed to work on joint responsibility, this premature statement provoked a retort from certain members of our party, including our Chief Whip. Naturally there was unpleasantness in the party. Later on we decided in our party that this question of the Simon Commission was to be a non-party issue and that individual members should be given the liberty of voting and acting in this matter as they liked. This House decided by an overwhelming majority that it would not co-operate with the Simon Commission as at present constituted. Thereupon, Dr. Subbarayan threatened to resign. (Voices of 'Oh', 'Did he'?) A day later, he informed us that he had already resigned, (Oh) and the resignation was in His Excellency's hands, (Dr. Mallayya: 'Bluff!') (Mr. Satyamurti: 'Oh') but we find that the resignation did not

13th March 1928] [Mr. R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar]

take effect. (Laughter.) (Mr. Satyamurti: Whose fault?) He informed us that he had asked His Excellency to accept his resignation but no action was taken on it. Then, on a subsequent date, I and my late Colleague Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar were definitely informed by Dr. Subbarayan that he had resigned his appointment and had asked the Government to give effect to it from the date of the departure of the Simon Commission from Madras. On account of this, either actual or threatened resignation, a good deal of trouble was caused in our party, and our party thought that it would lead to the immediate breaking up of the party to which we all belonged. It resulted in a good deal of confusion and turmoil. I had an interview with His Excellency on the question of Simon Commission resolution and His Excellency told me that those who acted against the Commission acted against the Government. (Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar: When was that?) I of course did not accept that view; for had I accepted that view I should have resigned at once. If a Minister acted against the Commission and boycotted it, I could not for the life of me see how he was acting against the Government. I do not want to say anything further, but I must say, Sir, finding that His Excellency took that view that anyone acting against the Commission was acting against the Government, I should have, as I said, resigned at once; but I did not for two reasons. Firstly because, I thought His Excellency was wrong and might change his view later and secondly, I had to meet my Colleague Mr. Ranganatham who was not in Madras and I wished to consult him on the matter as to what action I should take.

"The next thing that I would mention was the no-confidence motion brought in by the Leader of the Opposition against Dr. Subbarayan. This motion only wished to express its want of confidence in Dr. Subbarayan without stating any reasons. It was obviously a motion which no member of our party could support. Had the reasons been given, that it was because of his support to the Simon Commission, at least those members of our party who had committed themselves to the boycott would have been compelled to vote for it. (Mr. Satyamurti, Hear, hear.) The motion could not properly command the support of the members of the Independent Nationalist party. The motion failed. I shall not go into the reasons why we did not vote for it. But let me say this. So far as I and my friend here Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar are concerned, we did our level best to dissuade our members, for the reason that I had already explained, that the members of our party should loyally support our chief, the no-confidence did not refer to the Simon Commission. In fact, even on the date preceding the actual motion, we did our level best to dissuade all members of our party from having anything to do with it. I left the previous evening with the impression that the Simon Commission motion would not come off and that the members of our party would not support it. The motion failed. Subsequent to this, I and my colleagues had an interview with His Excellency the Governor. In that interview, His Excellency again and again reiterated the fact not only that the failure of the motion was a reversal of the previous vote of the Council concerning the Simon Boycott, but that it meant an affirmation of confidence in Dr. Subbarayan. (A voice: Wonderful logic?)

"Taking what transpired in the interviews that I had with His Excellency and considering the fact that His Excellency took the view that those who voted against the Commission were acting against the Government, I thought that I could not remain as a Minister any longer. The issue is so important

11-30
a.m.

[Mr. R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar] [13th March 1928]

that it is necessary that I should ask the indulgence of this House to refer to them very briefly. The proposition was that no Member of this House who was not definitely for the Commission should hold the office of Minister. I demur to that view. It meant that in any future selection of Ministers, hon. Members sitting in all sections of the House who had taken a prominent part in the public life of the country for many years and men with a distinguished record of service could have no part in any Ministry that may be formed. That is the logical sequence. Out of the 61 Members that voted for the Simon boycott, not one should be considered to be eligible in finding out our future Ministers. I think it is a constitutional issue of very great importance. It means an insult to this House. (Hear, hear.)

"Besides I take the view that the failure of the no-confidence motion against Dr. Subbarayan does not, as His Excellency wished to emphasize, mean a reversal of the policy of this House in regard to the Simon Commission. The motion itself, as I explained already, is a bald motion of no confidence. It did not intend to be a motion against Dr. Subbarayan on account of his views on the Simon Commission, but the motion was purely a bald motion of no confidence. The fact that it failed, or, had it succeeded, the fact of its success, would have made no difference in regard to the expressed opinion of this House. This House still sticks to its former resolution that it should have nothing to do with the Simon Commission as at present constituted. I believe the no-confidence motion has made absolutely no difference."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Order, Order. According to rule 10 (a) the hon. Member will be quite in order if he refers to the grounds for resigning the Ministership. I don't think he will be in order if he exhorts the Members of the Council as to their future conduct."

* Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"Thank you, Sir, there is only one other point that I should like to refer to. Reforms, Sir, at least future Reforms, belong to the portfolio of the hon. the Revenue Member. In matters pertaining to the administration of the reserved subjects Ministers may be consulted, but there is no obligation to consult, and if the Ministers did offer any advice the Reserved half were under no obligations whatsoever to accept that advice. Such being the case, Sir, I do not see how any Minister can be forced against his will to offer advice. In the administration of the reserved subjects, matters are decided as a rule by the Executive Council to which the Ministers have no admission and here we are or we were Ministers unwilling to take any part in this matter which concerned the reserved subjects. I see no reason why we should be forced against our will to take part in matters that do not pertain to our portfolios—in matters that have been definitely allotted to the Reserved half and that are being administered by the hon. the Revenue Member with the assistance of two special Secretaries whose pay is non-votable. I think it is very unreasonable that we should be asked to take part in this matter that does not pertain to us at all.

"I have nothing more to add except to appeal to the House in conclusion in regard to its prerogative, its dignity and its privileges.

"It should not be possible for any Government to turn out of office Ministers who are acting on the mandate of this House. (Hear, Hear.) I, Sir, acting on the mandate of this House and in obedience to it, did not do anything that this House could object to; and I certainly think that it is not for the Government to say that I was wrong. It is a matter of grave importance and I think

13th March 1928] [Mr. R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar]

the Government as well as the Ministers and Members are bound by the mandate of this House. If they chose to repudiate this mandate they would be taking on themselves a great responsibility and they would be acting against the very spirit of our democratic constitution: they will be undermining even the beginnings of responsible government. I therefore, Sir, appeal to all sections of this House to take up this constitutional point and I hope that they will with one accord say not merely that they are not going to co-operate with the Simon Commission, but that they will resist with all their might any attempt at the selection of Ministers only from those who are willing to co-operate with the Simon Commission. I hope that they will resent any attempt for the exclusion of all the many prominent Members of all sections of this House, men (as I said) who have a distinguished record of service, and that this House will resist any attempt to exclude the distinguished men of this House who have taken part in regard to the Simon Commission Boycott resolution.

"Finally, Sir, let me not be understood that I am not grateful to His Excellency for his uniform kindness to me as a Minister. As a gentleman with the best traditions of the English race he was always courteous and kind. I hope I shall remember always and keep in my mind the memory of the many acts of kindness and courtesy shown to me by His Excellency." (Cheers.)

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Under rule 10 (a), clause (3), a Member of the Government is entitled to make a statement pertinent to the statement of the Member who has resigned the Ministership. I have already given my consent to Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar to make a statement regarding the grounds of his resignation. I wish to know from the Treasury Bench whether they want to make a combined statement after hearing the statement of Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar or to make a statement on each one of the statements."

* The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS:—"Sir, if you permit me I should like to say a few words with regard to the references that have been made to His Excellency the Governor in this matter. If you consider that one statement should be made, I would leave it to the hon. the Minister."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I think it will be for the convenience of the House to hear the statement of Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar and to have a statement from Sir Norman Marjoribanks and also from Dr. Subbarayan. After all, as two Ministers have made two statements, the Government have got a right to make two different statements. It is a question of convenience. I wish to know the wishes of the various parties whether they want to adopt that procedure."

MR. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"Sir, if the Government waits till the other ex-Minister makes his statement and then makes a combined reply, I do not see why another Member of Government should also be permitted to make a statement. If, on the other hand, a reply is now given with reference to the statement made by Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar and also if Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar is allowed to make another statement and another reply is made by Government, then there will be two statements."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Since there is an objection, I think the rule is positive that only one statement is to be made unless Members of Government want to avail themselves of the two different statements and to make

[The President]

[13th March 1928]

two different statements as contemplated by sub-rule (3). I do not think I can allow two Members of the Government to make a statement after Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar has made a statement."

* The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—"In the circumstances, the one statement to be made on behalf of the Government will be made by Dr. Subbarayan."

* Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"Mr. President, Sir, it is one of the rights and duties of the Minister who resigns office to make a short statement to the Council, and with your permission I should like to take advantage of this privilege to explain to this House the reasons that have compelled me to resign my office as Minister"

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"My point of order, Sir, is whether the hon. Member is authorized to read his speech."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I have already said that important statements of Ministers can be read from a written speech."

* Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"I use the words 'rights' and 'duties' advisedly, right because it is to this House alone that it is possible to say many things that it would not be possible to say outside, and duty because it is as a Member of this House, and upon a mandate from it that any Member is entitled to occupy the position of a Minister. This is the very basis of Parliamentary representative government; and the authors of the Reforms recognized this principle as vital, and laid it down that a Minister was to be selected from that party which commanded the confidence of the House, and he was to continue to occupy his position only as long as he enjoyed this confidence and as long as he was an elected Member of the House. It is with this object that the salary of the Ministers has been made votable; it is this principle that constitutes the fundamental difference between the position of the Executive Councillors and the Ministers; it is in this fact alone that lay the justification of the Reforms of 1920. Under the Act the choice is legally vested with the Governor; in fact, the Ministers are and ought to be selected by the Council, and should continue in office only so long as they continue to hold the confidence of the Council.

11-45
a.m.

"This at least has been my point of view during all the 15 months I have had the honour to be a Minister. I have no desire to go over the whole controversy that centred round the formation of the Independent Ministry in December 1926; but this I may assert without controversy that, when the Congress party refused it, there was a general desire in the Presidency in favour of our party accepting office. The Congress party, though it refused office itself, was willing, perhaps as the lesser of two evils from its point of view, that we should shoulder the responsibility. It might be that the party thought so at the time and did not mind who held the fort, being sure, according to their calculations, of occupying the fort in a few months when they cared to do so. But, as you know, Sir, subsequent events have not justified those hopes of theirs, if they indeed entertained them, and at the close of the year we were still left to carry on the Government even though not the strongest party in the Council.

"It might be asked why I did carry on for so long if the position of the party in the Council was so weak? My answer is that though weak in

13th March 1928] [Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar]

numbers, I knew that I had the support of the House for my general policy. (Justicite laughter.) I did not say, Sir, 'of every section of the House' but of the House as a whole. Even afterwards, whenever I felt the need for money for one or other of my schemes initiated subsequent to the Budget session, I always came to the House for its renewal of confidence and I am grateful that it was never withheld. During the latter part of last year, the House might have observed that a number of supplementary demands were included in the agenda, but could not then be moved for one reason or another. At the next meeting of this Council, many of them were omitted from the agenda. I too might have done the same with regard to my demands, for there was the probability that at the next budget they might all pass through without notice or discussion. But I would not do so; I believed in the schemes on which I had spent so much time and labour to get to the stage when they could be submitted to the House. I clearly felt that it was my duty to take the earliest opportunity of getting the vote of the House for them so that they might be executed with the least possible delay. And I was justified in my anticipation and trust and the House passed all which I wanted them to pass."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Order, order. I am carefully listening to the hon. Member. A resumé of his work as Minister is not quite pertinent under the rule. I might draw the attention of the hon. Member to rule 10 (a):

'A Member who has resigned the office of Minister may with the consent of the President make a personal statement in explanation of his resignation.'

"I think, the hon. Member will be in order if he confines his remarks to the grounds of the resignation instead of giving a resumé of his office as Minister."

* Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"I beg to state, Sir, that I entirely agree with the ruling given by the Chair, but I was just explaining why I resigned and why I resigned at a particular time and not earlier.

"Sir, I have referred to these details only to show that my belief that the House was generally with me in regard to the administration of the Transferred Departments in my charge was not altogether without foundation. Needless to say that, further, I also sincerely believed that the Reforms though unsatisfactory, were still a weapon placed in our hands to win more power and it was with that spirit that I accepted office. (Mr. S. Satyamurti: 'You have now seen what it is,') As long as the Council trusted me I was desirous of doing all the good I could do with the limited powers of a Minister. In this belief, of course, lay my sole difference with my Congress friends. (Congress Members: 'Hear, hear,') Thus, Sir, I may say that I was inspired by two principles to accept office and carry on as long as I have done, namely, my belief in using the Reforms to get more power, and my desire to shoulder a responsibility that I believed that I was called upon by a fairly general consensus of opinion to do so.

"Now, Sir, to come to the reasons that have compelled me to resign my office. Believing myself as I did and as I still do, a servant of this House, a mirror to reflect its view, its mouthpiece, I have no doubt in my mind that whenever I found myself at variance on any fundamental principle with the views of the House, it would be my right and my duty to resign. (Hear, hear.) As an individual, I might hold any views; as a Minister I must reflect the

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar]

[13th March 1928]

views of the House on all fundamental matters, or I must resign. (Several voices : Hear, hear.) It was my position all along. That is my opinion still. It is not for me, Sir, to say how far I have kept up to this ideal during the last fifteen months; but, so far as I am aware, there is no occasion on which I have not acted up to this principle. This brings me to the vote of the House on the Simon Commission in January 25th. I need not remind you, Sir, that the advent of this Commission has caused a general feeling of resentment in the country which has succeeded in uniting all of us, irrespective of party labels and professions, in defence of the honour of our Motherland. (Mr. Sami Venkatachalam : Come here.) There are times in the history of a people when it is tested; there is no doubt in my mind that we are passing through such a time. The general feeling of resentment in the country at the advent of this Commission has been reflected in the Legislative Assembly and in most of the local Councils. And every prominent patriot in our country's cause has joined in the agitation against it. As was but to be expected, this House which but reflects the opinion of the country, passed a resolution on 25th January: 'That this Council recommends to the Government that they be pleased to convey to the Viceroy and His Majesty's Government that this Council has no confidence in and will have nothing to do with the Statutory Commission as it is at present constituted.' The resolution was carried by 61 votes against 29, 12 remaining neutral. As a Minister of the Council, elected by its reason of confidence in me, I naturally found it my duty to be bound by this emphatic decision of the Council; if I had found myself at variance with the Council on this point, I should have regarded it not only constitutional but also honourable to have resigned my office. (Hear, hear.) Whatever the opinion of an individual member of the Council may be, and whatever liberty he may have in the matter of cherishing and upholding these opinions, as Ministers we are the executive of the Council and bound by its solemn mandate. But, as it was, the decision of the Council reflected my own views, and therefore, I saw no reason why I need resign. My hon. Colleague, the First Minister, differing from my view had publicly declared his opinion with regard to the futility of the boycott of the Commission, and even in this House voted against the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition as further amended by Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar. Thus it was clear that the Ministry was divided with regard to the resolution of the Council and had I been in the place of the First Minister, I should have felt that the only constitutional course for me was to tender my resignation. But as the House is well aware, he has not done so up to date and he has been allowed to go against the very principles of responsible Government. Having in view the anomalous position of the Ministry, as well as the unconstitutional position taken up by the First Minister, I and my colleague would have determined upon and pursued a definite line of policy but for the fact that the hon. the First Minister gave us to understand on more than one occasion that he had either resigned or was on the point of resigning and so on.

"With regard to my own decision to respect the resolution of the Council, I never maintained any secrecy. I took an early opportunity to acquaint both His Excellency and the public that I was going to respect the resolution. From that time till the end of February, nothing happened to change my original views nor did I see any reason as has been advanced in one local newspaper that my holding the office as Minister was incompatible with my decision to respect the resolution of the Council. What was the

13th March 1928]

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar]

good of my being a popular Minister as distinct from the Members of the Executive Council, if I did not represent the popular view in the Government? Nor did co-operation or non-co-operation with the Commission in any way interfere, up to the date I resigned, with the discharge of my duties as Minister. Indeed, in the Central Provinces, both the Ministers have long ago announced their determination not to have anything to do with the Commission and yet they continue in office. On March 2nd was brought forward the no-confidence motion against the First Minister and as the House is well aware, leave was not granted for it to be moved as the requisite number of 42 members did not stand up in their places. It is not for me to go into the reasons for this failure; my concern is with the interpretation of this incident. The peculiar view was taken that the implications of this failure were firstly the reversal of the Council's resolution of 25th January, secondly its expression of confidence in the First Minister and his policy and consequently its censure of the attitude of myself and the Third Minister. I need not say that in my view this is a grotesque misrepresentation of the incident of 2nd March. But, for that very reason, I considered it my duty to myself, to the Council and to the country and even to the authority responsible for my choice as Minister to tender my resignation to His Excellency the Governor. The issue, in my opinion, was this: either the interpretation referred to above was wrong or was right. If it was right, it was my duty to resign, because I could not conscientiously carry out the decision of the Council to co-operate with the Commission. If it was wrong, it was equally my duty to resign so that the Council might have an opportunity of affirming and of re-affirming if need be its determination to boycott the Commission and uphold our right, the most sacred right of a people to determine its own form of Government. (Cheers.)

"It has been suggested in some quarters that the step I took was hasty and that I might have delayed it and waited to be dismissed. On the surface there may be something to be said for this line of argument. It might have been possible for me to get the Council at the Budget time to declare definitely one way or the other and set at rest any doubts held in some quarters. But I wish to take the House into my confidence on this matter and I declare that I fully believed that I did not resign a day too early. The position was this; I could have gone through the Budget taking upon myself the responsibility of passing the demands through. But once the Council was adjourned I fully believed that another issue would be brought forward to force me to tender my resignation so that a new Minister would have been installed in the office who for about six months would have been free from the vote and control of this House. To my mind the Simon Commission was the only issue which at the present time should determine the relation between the Council and the Ministers. But, with the First Minister against me, not only on this but in many matters of administrative importance I could not be sure that that issue would not be easily clouded. Hence, if I had to resign, I must do it immediately, so that any new Ministers who are appointed may have to take the sanction of the Council for their attitude with regard to the fundamental issue on which the First Minister and myself differed.

"Again it was possible that I may have been given the same latitude that was allowed to the First Minister after 25th January to continue in office even though I was at variance with the views of the Council as interpreted by some authorities. But, in that case, I should have considered myself to have

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar] [13th March 1928]

betrayed the trust of the Council and of the country and even of the Governor. I believe that agreement or disagreement between the Council and the Ministry on this question is of fundamental importance; and I venture to believe that whatever our differences of opinion in regard to other matters, on the point of the Commission we are one. It is because of this that I considered it my duty to resign and come back to you to ask you to uphold the honour of the House and of the country.

12
noon.

"One further word and I have done. Attempts are naturally being made to find substitutes for us. I have no desire to hamper them. But let us clearly understand what the implications of success in this direction would mean. It would mean firstly that this Council does not know its own mind, and is not bound by any principles. None of the 61 members who voted for the boycott of the Commission on 25th January can with any honour for their plighted word accept to co-operate with the Simon Commission. Secondly, it would mean that the Government has been proved to be right in its taunt that agitation against the Commission is mere froth on the surface, to be ignored with impunity. Thirdly, it would mean that there is no good any one of us placing trust upon the word of our people. There is only one answer possible, and that is, by this Council refusing consent to the formation of any Ministry (Mr. S. Satyamurti: Hear, hear) that does not explicitly stand for the boycott of the Commission. Sir, this is not a question of personalities, or tactical advantage. It matters not the least who is the Minister; it matters everything whether one should place reliance upon our word. As long as the Ministers are not allowed to act in this matter with the Council it should not be possible for any authority to form a Ministry. Much better that Diarchy should go rather than those who are entrusted with the duty and the privilege of representing the views of the Council should in reality misinterpret them. (Hear, hear.)

"Thus, to my mind, the position is this: this House should not allow the vacant places to be filled up unless it be with those who interpret the will and the opinion of the Council. The remedy is at hand. Probably it may be intended to keep our places vacant till after the budget, and then to give the new Ministers a start of five or six months before the next meeting of the Council. If that be the idea, the only way to prevent it is by the entire omission of the salary of the Ministers. That would ensure that the Ministers who are to be appointed will be those who reflect its views."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Order, order. I request the hon. Member to reserve those remarks for another opportunity that may arise."

* Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"One word more, Sir, and I am done. I believe, Sir, that if ever there was a Governor who was willing to make the Reforms a success and under whom they could have been made a success, it was His Excellency Lord Goschen. But I fear the opportunity has been lost. All the same, I would like publicly to thank His Excellency the Governor for his uniform courteous and sympathetic treatment of myself and of the departments placed under me." (Loud applause.)

* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—"Mr. President, when His Excellency the Governor did me the honour of inviting me to form a Ministry, I accepted that kind invitation and put forward the names of the hon. Members who have just spoken as my Colleagues. (A voice: late Colleagues.) His Excellency accepted these gentlemen as Ministers on my recommendation. Some short while back I represented to His Excellency that there were

13th March 1928]

[Dr. P. Subbarayan]

differences between me and my Colleagues, into which I do not propose to enter at present, and that we could no longer work harmoniously, and suggested that either my Colleagues or I should part company. (A voice: Why?) His Excellency discussed the situation with them and the second and third Ministers, on that, seem to have proffered their resignations and as His Excellency was aware that a vote of no-confidence against me had failed to obtain the necessary support of the House—(Cries of No, No.)—That is the implication, you can cry no, no, if you like. (Mr. S. Satyamurti:—“He laughs best who laughs last.”) (Another voice: Wait and see.) I am quite willing to wait and see.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—“Order, order. I think the Members of the House will do well to hear calmly the statement of the sole Minister.”

* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—“I was trying to speak calmly, Sir, but if hon. Members interrupt, I have every right to hit them back, and I mean doing that. (A voice: Do not get excited.) The two Ministers proffered their resignations as I was saying, and as His Excellency was aware that a vote of no-confidence against me had failed to obtain the necessary support of the House, he felt he had no option but to accept the resignations thus proffered. (Dr. B. S. Mallayya: On your recommendation!) (Laughter.) The hon. Members who have spoken have referred to differences of opinion regarding the Simon Commission. The question of the Simon Commission is a reserved subject under our diarchic constitution. (Dr. B. S. Mallayya Who reserved it?) His Excellency was influenced by the difference of opinion between the Ministers rather than by the particular opinions held by such of them, which made him accept their resignations. (A voice: Did you resign?). I do not, Sir, now propose to enter into any detail, as I said with regard to the resignation of my hon. Colleagues, the Member for Bellary and the Member for the Central Districts Christian Constituency. It was really a surprise to me to learn from the newspapers of the 7th evening that they contemplated resignation. This was confirmed by a message on the telephone next morning by the hon. Member for Bellary who even then did not divulge any reasons for the step he and his friend had taken. The reason that impelled my hon. Friend from Bellary to take this step is contained in his letter of resignation to His Excellency which was published in the Press, for which I do not know if he chose to obtain the permission of His Excellency which is the usual procedure. I have only one statement to make in this connexion, and that is that my hon. Friends might have informed me of the step they proposed to take. Instead it is an open secret now that they summoned the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for counsel. In his lengthy statement to the Press, the hon. Member for Bellary, as pointed out by the Leader of the Opposition, makes no answer at all to the question by the Press on this point. The statement of the Leader of the Opposition issued yesterday shows why they took this step. One can also now understand why the two Ministers issued a statement to the Press about their attitude on the Simon Commission a month after the decision of the Council but just before the no-confidence motion against me in this House was tabled. It is therefore now quite clear that at least the hon. Member for Bellary had a part, however remote it may have been, in the no-confidence motion that was moved against me. This cuts right across any idea of joint responsibility, or it seems to me, of any reasonable conception of the relations which should exist among men so placed as we were; because if the hon. Member for Bellary

[Dr. P. Subbarayan]

[13th March 1928]

had any differences with me, it was for him to have informed His Excellency that he could not continue to serve with me as the Chief of the Ministry. Instead, he was, as the letter of the Leader of the Opposition shows, a party to the no-confidence motion against me. How any joint responsibility is compatible with this I cannot say. Besides, my hon. Friend the Diwan Bahadur, the Member for the Central Districts Christians, has always argued against any such joint responsibility. What is more, the very fact that the members of the Congress Party who always stood for joint responsibility, chose to put forward a motion of no-confidence in one Minister shows that even they were going against their professed opinions. The hon. Members will surely understand now it is not I who has thrown to the winds the idea of joint responsibility of the Ministers. That charge, Mr. President, must be laid at other doors." (Applause.) (Mr. S. Satyamurti: It seems an after-thought.)

VI

DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS FOR 1927-28.

Grant III.

- * The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—" Sir, I beg to move
*'that the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs. 54,000 under
 "Grant III—Stamps—Reserved".'*

"This sum is required because, as hon. Members will no doubt remember, last year the Government of India introduced certain amendments to the Indian Stamp Act"

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" On a point of order, Sir. We have not known yet who the Law Member is, and this is now being moved by the hon. Mr. Campbell. I do not know whether he is in order in doing so."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The hon. Member may take it that Mr. Campbell is the hon. the Law Member."

* The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—" As I said, under the amendments introduced by the Finance Act of 1927 into the Indian Stamp Act no stamp duty is leviable on cheques drawn on or after 1st July 1927. On that date the Banks and other bodies in this Presidency had in their possession a large number of unused cheque forms which had been stamped. In accordance with the provisions of the law, the stamp duty levied on those cheques had to be refunded. It is to meet the cost of these refunds that this additional amount of Rs. 54,000 is required. I beg to move that this sum be granted."

The hon. Mr. T. E. Moir seconded the motion.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is that the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs. 54,000 under 'Grant III—Stamps—Reserved'."

* Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasaya :—" Sir, I stand to oppose the motion for the grant of Rs. 54,000. The reason is this: The Government have time after time given us promises to reduce the enhanced stamp duties levied since 1922. In 1927, on the budget discussions, the hon. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur made the following statement"